

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 10/079,003 02/20/2002 Peter Haug 1376-01 6145 35811 7590 09/14/2004 **EXAMINER** IP DEPARTMENT OF PIPER RUDNICK LLP ALEJANDRO, RAYMOND ONE LIBERTY PLACE, SUITE 4900 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 1650 MARKET ST PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103 1745

DATE MAILED: 09/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Advisory Action | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|--|-------------------|----------------------------|
| | 10/079,003 | HAUG ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Raymond Alejandro | 1745 |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 16 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a inal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | | |
| PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)] | | |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension see have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension see under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or 2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if mely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because: | | |
| (a) ☑ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); | | |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); | | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or | | |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. | | |
| NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | | |
| The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: | | |
| The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | | |
| 7.⊠ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)⊠ will not be entered or b)□ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-11</u> . | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | |
| B. \square The drawing correction filed on is a) \square approved or b) \square disapproved by the Examiner. | | |
| D. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | | |
| 0. ☐ Other: | | |
| | | RAM |
| | | Raymond Alejandro Examiner |
| Potent and Trade Off | | Art Unit: 1745 |

Continuation of 2. NOTE: new issue: (claim 1) the amendment replacing now the limitation "electrodeposited" with "electrochemically deposited" as originally intended. In this regard, it is noted that a new ground of rejection was provided in order to adress the newly recited limitation (i.e. "electrodeposited") as presented in the amendment of 02/02/04. Thus, it now raises new issues. (claim 1) the specific electrochemically deposited crystallite of either "Cu or alloys thereof". It is also noted that by incorporating the limitation of claim 3 into independent claim and picking-and-choosing the specific metal crystallite a new issue requiring further search and/or consideration is raised.